

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/040,470 01/09/2002		Kaoru Matsumoto	2576		
75	7590 09/29/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
LORUSSO & LOUD			TAMAI, KARL I		
3137 Mt. Vernon Avenue Alexandria, VA 22305			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2834		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

B	
Y	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/040,470	MATSUMOTO, KAORU				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tamai IE Karl	2834				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 23 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE: claim 21 depending from 20 is a new issu	ue.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s): the objection to claim 21					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>18-22</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 4-14 and 17.						
B.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449)	KARL TAMAL				
10. Other:		PRIMARY EXAMINES				
		Tamai IE Karl Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2834				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's argument that the casing of thomas is not-laminated is unpersuasive because rings 62 are metal plate or laminations. Applicant's argument regarding the motor being opposite the heat sink is not persuasive because Umeda clearly shows the fan mounted opposite the heat sink. The Applicant's argumen regarding the structure of the casing being separate from the heat sink is not persuasive because the limitation is not in the claims. The Applicant's argument that Wang does not teach laminations that are face to face with only an inner circular circumference is not persuasive because it is clearly shown Figure 6.